REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

With respect to the earlier-submitted Chinese office actions in the IDS dated October 10, 2007, it was not believed that the dates of the office actions were needed since the office actions themselves do not constitute prior art. In any event, a new form PTO/SB/08a is attached which includes the dates of the first and second Chinese office actions earlier submitted. For the Examiner's convenience, also attached are additional copies of English translations of the two office actions with hand-annotated dates written thereon. Accordingly, it is believed that these documents should be considered at this point in the prosecution of this application without any additional fee or declaration being necessary.

In response to the formality-based objection to claim 1, claim 1 has been further amended above so as obviate this objection. Under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §1.116, entry of this amendment is respectfully requested.

The rejection of claims 1-6, 11-12, 17, 19-20, 22-23, 27, 29, 42-43, 49-50, 52, 56-58 and 67-68 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly anticipated by Ball '502 is respectfully traversed.

Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, there is no reference in Ball to a node providing output in both directions – Ball simply describes having two networks, each propagating information in a particular direction (see the abstract).

Ball describes a network linking user behavior observed by an observer and emotion and personality conveyed by the agent. The observing network facilitates differencing user emotional and personality states from the behavior observed by the observer, as well as an agent network facilitating inferencing of agent behavior from emotion and personality states to be conveyed by an agent. Ball teaches that the observing network can be a Bayesian network and the agent network is another Bayesian network. Each network includes a first layer of multi-state nodes that represent respective emotional and personality variables and a second layer of multi-state nodes which represent respective behavioral variables.

Ball teaches that the two Bayesian networks each perform inferencing in opposite directions, but in neither network can a node <u>propagate its output</u> in both a forwards and backwards direction (see abstract and col. 17, lines 27 to 37).

Thus, Ball does not teach a framework in which a node has the ability to propagate its output in both directions.

As there is nothing in Ball which would teach a person of ordinary skill in the art that a network can be provided which enables a node to provide output propagating in both directions in a behavioral framework of nodes – a feature which is currently recited in the pending claims – the claims cannot be anticipated by Ball. If the Examiner believes otherwise, the Examiner is respectfully requested to indicate more specifically in the text of Ball where a node is described which provides output propagating in both directions within a single Bayesian network.

Given the fundamental deficiencies already noted above with respect to Ball, it is not believed necessary at this time to point out further deficiencies of this reference with respect to other aspects of the rejected claims. Suffice it to note that, as a matter of law, it is impossible for any reference to anticipate a claim unless it teaches each and every feature of that claim.

The rejection of claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being made "obvious" based on Ball in view of Sato and in further view of Hatlelid '333 is also respectfully traversed.

Fundamental deficiencies of Ball have already been noted above with respect to parent claim 1. The secondary and tertiary references do not supply those fundamental deficiencies. Accordingly, it is not believed necessary at this time to detail the additional

Daniel BALLIN, et al. Serial No. 10/550,205 September 8, 2008

deficiencies of this allegedly "obvious" combination of references and the selective hindsight interpretation of such as set forth in the office action.

Accordingly, this entire application is now believed to be in allowable condition, and a formal notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By:

Larry S. Nixon

LSN:lef

901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor

Arlington, VA 22203-1808

Telephone: (703) 816-4000 Facsimile: (703) 816-4100